ED 014 632

AC 001 424

GEORGIA STATE PLAN FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968 UNDER TITLE 1, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965. ANNUAL AMENDMENT. GEORGIA UNIV., ATHENS

PUB DATE

67

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.64 39F.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, *EVALUATION, *COMMUNITY PROBLEMS, *COMMUNITY LEADERS, *STATE PROGRAMS, UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, COMMUNITY PLANNING, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, COMMUNITY SERVICES, CITY OFFICIALS, COUNTY OFFICIALS, COMMUNICATION (THOUGHT TRANSFER), MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, HUMAN RELATIONS, INTERGROUP RELATIONS, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS, FEDERAL AID, GEORGIA, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT (1965),

IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 1 OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, THE GEORGIA STATE AGENCY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION SPONSORED CONFERENCES TO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS AND TO ASSIGN PRIORITIES TO PROBLEM AREAS. DURING THE EIGHT REGIONAL CONFERENCES, ATTENDED BY 317 COMMUNITY LEADERS AND INTERESTED CITIZENS FROM 95 GEORGIA COUNTIES, 92 SPECIFIC COMMUNITY PROBLEMS WERE IDENTIFIED. MEMBERS OF A STATEWIDE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (INCLUDING 19 REPRESENTATIVES OF HIGHER EDUCATION) REVIEWED THE PROBLEMS CITED AND UNDERYOOK TO SET PRIORITIES. MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS THEN ASSIGNED THE FOLLOWING RANK ORDER TO THE BROAD PROBLEM AREAS--COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING, OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, HUMAN RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATION AMONG ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIOECONOMIC GROUPS, SELF REALIZATION, AND FAMILY LIFE. THE STATE AGENCY DETERMINED THAT DURING 1968 HIGHEST PRIORITY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO IMPROVING COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS OF MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES, AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATION. (THE DOCUMENT INCLUDES FUNDING PROPOSALS, DATA ON PARTICIPANTS, AND PROBLEM AREAS AND PRIORITIES.) (LY)

TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

ANNUAL AMENDMENT

to

Georgia State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education Programs for Fiscal Year 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965



Georgia Community Continuing Education Service

State Agency: University of Georgia

TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

ANNUAL AMENDMENT

to

Georgia State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education Programs for Fiscal Year 1968

In accordance with Section 173.4 of the Regulations for Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Fiscal Year 1968 Annual Amendment to the Georgia State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education Programs is herewith submitted. The priority of problem areas as contained in this Amendment were established by the Georgia State Agency and approved by the Georgia State Advisory Council after extensive consultation with state and local leaders and citizens as herein described.

Due consideration has been given to the existence of other federally financed programs dealing with similar and other community problems, and to the resources of institutions of higher education that are existent or adaptable to the development and operation of community continuing education programs related to specific aspects of the selected community problems.

In accordance with Section 173.20 (b) of the Regulations, the Georgia State Agency assures the Commissioner of Education that Notices of Activation will be submitted to the U.S. Office of Education within 10-15 days after the approval of each program by the State Agency.

The relevant resources of participating institutions of higher education have been determined in accordance with Section 4 of the Georgia State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education Programs.



PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING THE PRIORITY OF PROBLEM AREAS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

The Georgia State Agency for Community Service and Continuing Education has approached the task of problem identification and assignment of priorities to problem areas by soliciting the advice of Georgia's leadership through a series of conferences conducted over the State and at the University of Georgia. The series consisted of eight (3) regional conferences, a conference for state-wide leaders and organizations, and a conference for representatives of institutions of higher education participating in the Title I program.

REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Regional conferences were conducted at Carrollton, Rome, Tifton, Columbus, Douglas, Brunswick, Savannah and Athens. Community leaders and interested citizens from ninety-five (95) Georgia counties were invited to attend these conferences. More than three hundred (300) of these leaders participated in the regional conferences. The groups included representatives of public and higher education, civic groups, business and industry, government and government related agencies, and officials of federal, state, and local government. Enclosure (1) provides a summary of the groups represented in the eight (8) regional conferences. Enclosure (2) indicates the occupations and professions of the participants.

Each of the regional conferences were approximately six (6) hours in duration. The morning sessions were devoted primarily to discussing the provisions of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Georgia State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education. Guest speakers were utilized to present the broad perspective as to Georgia's economic and social position in relation to other states, and to establish the framework within



which institutions of higher education must work for the solution of community problems. The groups were divided into sub-groups for the afternoon sessions. The objective of each sub-group was to identify and discuss the dimensions of the most pressing problems confronting communities in that area of the state. Approximately three (3) hours were devoted to the small group discussions.

Ninety-two (92) specific community problems were identified in the eight (8) regional conferences. The problems are listed in Enclosure (3). It should be noted that many of the same problems were identified in each of the conferences. CONFERENCE FOR STATE LEADERS

Following the completion of the regional conferences, a six (6) hour conference for leaders who have state-wide responsibilities was conducted at the University of Georgia. The purpose of the conference was to provide opportunity for state leaders to examine and react to the problems identified in the regional conferences, and to give their views as to the priority of these problems. Sixty-one (61) persons participated in this conference, including nineteen (19) representatives of institutions of higher education. The conference participants are listed in Enclosure (4).

Following a brief presentation on Title I and the Georgia State Plan, the group was divided into three sub-groups. A summary of identified problems, grouped under broad headings and arranged so as to provide space for assigning priorities and feasibility ratings, was provided each participant. The sub-groups were instructed not to attempt to arrive at consensus, but to freely discuss the problem areas so as to allow opportunity for individual views and interests to come before the group.

At the close of the conference, the participants were asked to assign priorities to the broad problems and feasibility ratings to specific aspects of the problems. Enclosure (5) is the instrument utilized and presents the



the results of the rating.

COUNCIL OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

The Georgia State Agency has created a Council of Participating Institutions, composed of one representative from each institution electing to participate in the Title I program. This Council presents an opportunity for institutions of higher education to express their views and participate in the development of the annual amendment to the Georgia State Plan.

Members of the Council of Participating Institutions participated in the conference for state leaders. The following day, the Council me, and was asked to rank order the six broad problem areas outlined on pages 10-11, Addendum No. 1 of the Georgia State Plan for Community Service and Continuing Education. The results of this ranking are given in Enclosure (6). It should be noted that these results compare favorably with the priority ratings obtained in the conference for state leaders.

In addition to the formal aspects of the problem identification process, the State Agency maintains continuous and close contact with Georgia leaders and provides instructional programs in a broad range of subjects to meet the needs of this state. In the course of its normal operation the University of Georgia conducts numerous studies on community problems and collects data on these problems from a wide variety of sources and groups. The results of these studies and the continuous interaction between the State Agency and countless groups and interests provides additional information to supplement the data upon which decisions can be made as to the priority of problems.



PRIORITIES OF PROBLEM AREAS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Having assembled the views of the "grass roots" leadership through regional conferences, the views of state leaders, and the views of colleges and universities as represented on the Council of Participating Institutions, the Georgia State Agency has determined that the greatest opportunity for higher education to have an impact on community problems can be effected by concentrating on three problem areas in Fiscal Year 1968. These three problem areas in order of priority are as follows:

- 1. Community Planning and Development
- 2. Occupational Competence of Government Officials
- 3. Human Relations Communications

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Communities in Georgia are caught up in a period of rapid change. Some of this change is internally generated, while other change is in response to influences outside the local community over which the local citizens have little if any control. With the increasing accumulation of scientific knowledge, and with the development of technological innovations, specialization, and urbanization, both scope and tempo of community change are increasingly complex, threatening local community capacity to cope with the problems arising therefrom.

Comprehensive community planning is the key to community development but it is often non-existent, and where existing the plans are too often not followed. This is often the result of a lack of leadership or the failure of the leadership to understand the community and its problems. The problem is made more complex by the general apathy on the part of many citizens toward community problems.



Comprehensive community planning is frequently impeded by the existence of archaic local governmental structures. City charters and ordinances are often outdated and conflicting, and in some cases have been adopted using unlawful procedures. Irrational and non-functional allocations of government services and responsibilities between cities and counties lead in many instances to wasteful duplication of services and in others to failure by either city or county to provide needed services. Scarcity of financial resources compounded by the inadequacies of local tax structure and administration limits the ability of communities to implement comprehensive plans where they exist.

and by many if the same

Manpower supply and demand is a constant problem requiring systematic and continuing planning. On the one hand are those communities which are losing young, trained talent because of insufficient employment with opportunities for advancement, and on the other are those communities which are being overwhelmed by the rapid influx of unskilled workers.

It is therefore proposed that in Fiscal Year 1968 first priority will be given to the broad problem areas of community planning and development.

Examples of the kinds of specific problems to which instructional programs will be directed are:

- 1. Outdated local government structures and their legal foundations.
- 2. Problems of generating or finding financial resources with which to meet the increasing public demand for quality services in rural, suburban, and urban areas.
- 3. Lack of comprehensive community planning.
- 4. Lack of effective and knowledgeable community leadership.
- 5. Lack of leadership among poverty groups.
- 6. The problem of community planning as it relates to such specific areas as industrial development, the decaying inner city, recreational facilities and programs, and the like.

7. The problems of manpower supply and demand created by the population shift from rural to urban and suburban communities.

OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

Georgia has 159 units of county government and over 550 incorporated municipalities. In the small units, of government, the number of officials is limited and in many cases consists of part-time employees, while in the larger urban areas the number of employees is large and is increasing rapidly. Regardless of staff size, however, local officials are responsible for an almost overwhelming number of functions and services for which there are ever-increasing demands for quantitative expansion and qualitative improvement. Some idea of the range of knowledge and abilities required for the effective performance of local government functions and rendering of local government service can be gathered by reviewing only a partial list: public buildings, code enforcement, corrections, utilities, fire protection, streets and highways, traffic engineering, housing, hospitals, libraries, parks, police, health, safety, sanitation, welfare, public works, recreation, schools, tax revenue, transportation, urban renewal and the like.

Contrasted with the demands of their jobs for general and specialized competence is the fact that the great majority of local government officials have had little, if any, systematic, specialized training for their responsibilities, particularly those employed outside the very largest urban centers; and even for those with previous training, the rapid expansion of knowledge in their specialties and the changing character of their work make it imperative that they keep themselves up-to-date through continuing education.

Since many community problems are either created or intensified by inadequate levels of training and competence of government personnel, it is proposed that second priority in Fiscal Year 1968 be given to the implementation of programs designed to improve the quality and efficiency of local and state



government officials and employees. Examples of specific problems to which instructional programs will be directed include among others:

- 1. Lack of specific skills to fulfill operational responsibilities.
- 2. Lack of understanding of fundamental principles of personnel administration.
- 3. Lack of training in modern methods and principles of supervision.
- Failure of officials and employees to understand the proper role and functions of their office position or agency.
- 5. Inadequate knowledge of implications of recent legislation and court rulings.
- 6. Lack of skill in developing and maintaining good human relations with both the public and other elements of government.
- 7. Lack of understanding of community problems caused by urbanization and technological advances.
- 8. Lack of knowledge of sources and means for financing local government services.

Target groups for these programs will include government officials and employees such as:

- 1. Fiscal officers
- 2. Tax administrators
- 3. Law enforcement officers
- 4. Sanitation personnel
- 5. Clerical personnel
- 6. Mayors
- 7. City and county managers
- 8. Councilmen
- 9. Commissioners
- 10. Department heads
- 11. Board members, both appointed and elected

HUMAN RELATIONS - COMMUNICATIONS

The quality of interpersonal and intergroup relationships is basic to the vitality and well-being of any community. The achievement and maintenance of good human relationships requires effort along many fronts, but a vital condition for success is the ability of individuals and groups to establish and maintain open lines of communication and to use the communication process effectively in solving community problems.

Effective communications skills are absolutely essential for community leaders that are to be at all effective in either educational programs or substantive community action programs designed to enhance social and economic progress. The quality of human relations between individuals and groups is directly dependent on the quality of communications. Two problems are especially pertinent: (1) understanding and utilizing basic communications principles and (2) establishing and maintaining effective interpersonal communications channels.

Serious lack of mutual understanding and effective communications exist too often between the following groups:

- 1. Urban and rural
- 2. White and non-white
- 3. Affluent and the non-affluent
- 4. Youth and adults
- 5. Labor and management
- 6. Official, public agencies and volunteer organization and agencies

It is, therefore, proposed that in Fiscal Year 1968, institutions of higher education will develop and implement programs designed to come to grips with the problem of communications and human relations.



PROPOSED ALLOCATION FOR USE OF FISCAL 1968 FUNDS ASSUMING 50%-50% MATCHING

Since Georgia's share of the Congressional appropriation for Title I is not yet known, the proposed allocation for programs will be equal to the total Georgia share of the appropriation less the amount budgeted for administration. The proposed program budget reflects the percentage of the funds available for programs which will be allocated to the problem areas given priority in Fiscal Year 1968.

			Pe	ercent of Prog	ram Funds
Pro	gram		Federal Funds	Matching Funds	Total
1.	Community Plann Development	ing and	40%	40%	40%
2.	Occupational Co Government Pers	-	35%	35%	35%
3.	Human Relations	- Communicati	ons 25%	25%	25%
			errors described the s		
		Tota?	100%	100%	100%
Adm	inistration				
Ope	rating Expenses		\$ 2,925	\$ 2,925	\$ 5 , 850
Tra	vel		3,550	3,550	7,100
Cap	ital Outlay		300	300	600
Per	sonal Services		12,925	12,925	25 , 850
		Total	\$19,700	\$19,700	\$ 39 , 400



CERTIFICATION OF STATE PLAN

Certification by official of the State Agency authorized to submit
the State Plan.
State ofGeorgia I hereby certify that the attached State
Plan or Amendment was duly adopted by the State Agency on
, and will constitute the basis for
participation of the State of Georgia under Title I of the
Higher Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329).
(Date) (Signature)
(Title of authorized official)
Certificate of appropriate State legal officer (to accompany
original plan).
State of Georgia . I hereby certify that The University of Georgia , (Name of Agency)
the State Agency named in the plan, is the sole agency for administration
of the plan or for supervision of the administration of the plan; and that
such State Agency has authority under State law to develop, submit, and
administer or supervise the administration of the plan and that all provisions
contained in the plan are consistent with State law.
(Date) (Signature)
(Title)
(



SUMMARY OF ATTENDANCE IN EIGHT AREA PLANNING CONFERENCES

Total	cou	nties to which invitations were sent:	95			
Count	ies :	represented by participarts:	76			
i.	Loca	al Government Officials	1.9			
	B. C. D. E. F.	City Managers (5) Mayors (5) Board of Education (2) Local Board of Roads & Revenue (1) Police Officer (1) County Commissioners (2) City Councilmen (3)				
II.	Gove	ernment and Government Related Agencies	117			
	3. C.	Local Government Agencies (18) State Agencies (65) Regional Agencies (19) Federal Agencies (9)				
III.	Stat	te Government Officials	6			
		Legislators (3) Judges (3)				
IV.	Educ	eation	107			
	B. C.	State or Regional Educational Personnel (14) School Administrators (37) College Personnel (51) Teachers (5)				
٧.	Civi	le Groups	16			
VI.	Busi	ness & Industry	47			
VII.	Other 11					



West Georgia College
Berry College
Abraham Baldwin College
Columbus College
Brunswick Junior College

142444

South Georgia College Armstrong State College

University of Georgia

OCCUPATIONS AND PROFESSIONS REPRESENTED IN EIGHT REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Secretary Housewife Chemical Engineer Labor Analyst Clerk, Board of Roads & Revenue	Librarian Banker Forester Industry Sales	Social Work Judge City Manager Utility Personnel College Faculty	County Agents Secondary School Faculty Extension Home Economist Community Planner Family and Children Services	Occupation or Profession
	н	91111	4 7 1 8 5 4 7 1 8 5	1
H L L C L	32737	J 3	7 3	2
1	1	4 4	11 9 9 7	3
4 H	Н	6 1	2213	4
		+ 8 +	ω —	5
н	ν ω	5 1 1		6
44	11 24	o o	н Фн	7
	∞ ω	4 1	υν4 ω	œ
12 1 1	11 4 2 16 8	10 2 5 1 51	28 42 15 26 14	TOTAL

. 1

Occupation or Profession	1	2	3	7	5	9	7	8	TOTAL
Federal Aviation Agent							-		-
Civic Groups							2	0	7
County Commissioner							1	l e-	· _
State Legislator								-, ۱	-, t
Optometrist								- ۱	l r
Hospital Administrator									

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN THE EIGHT AREA PLANNING CONFERENCES

Number of Conferences in which problem was identified	Pro	blem	
	I.	0cc	cupational Competence
(6)		A.	Poor management of public funds.
(6)		В.	Lack of understanding of tax administration.
(2)		C.	Law enforcement personnel do not understand the effects of recent court rulings on legal rights.
(2)		D.	Law enforcement personnel practice poor human relations.
(3)		E.	Municipal and county employees generally untrained.
(1)			a. Sanitation personnel
(1)			b. Clerical personnel
(7)		F.	City and county officials are untrained.
(1)			a. Mayors
(1)			b. City Managers
(1)			c. Councilmen
(1.)			d. Commissioners
(2)			e. Department Heads
(8)		G.	Lay board members not familiar with functions and responsibilities or problems and needs of their programs.
(1)		H.	Government officials lack skill in communications
(2)		ľ.	Government personnel untrained to deal with urban problems.
(8)		 • ان	Officials do not know about the many sources of financing projects.
(1)		К.	Prestige of law enforcement is low.



Number of Conferences in which problem was identified	Dual law	
rdencified	Problem	
(1)	${ m L}_{ullet}$	Law enforcement personnel are not able to recognize (1) emotional illness (2) diabetics (3) alcoholism, etc.
(1)	M.	Counselors who work with poverty groups are frequently untrained in counseling techniques and principles of motivation.
(14)	N.	Sub-professional personnel are untrained.
(1)		a. Bus Drivers
(3)		b. Teacher Aides
(1)		c. Planning and Development personnel
(1)		d. Substitute teachers
(3)	0.	Adult educators have not yet solved the problem of getting public to participate in adult education programs. Those who could benefit the most, participate the least.
(1)	₽.	Persons who work with poverty groups are not trained in personal finance, nutrition, etc.
(3)	Q.	There is a shortage of foster homes.
(3)	R.	Those who operate foster homes are untrained. They do not understand the principles of child development nor the problems of the children.
(1)	s.	Shortage of teachers in technical fields.
(1)	\mathtt{T}_{ullet}	Adult Basic Education program for mentally retarded.
(2)	U.	Adult Basic Education program is not reaching enough people.
(1)	٧.	Programs for those who work with the mentally ill not available locally.
(3)	W.	Business leaders do not understand nor practice sound job analysis. This adds to the unemployment problem. Disabled and uneducated.

Number of Conferences in which problem was identified	°01-1	
TGGILOT LTGG	Problem	
(2)	Х.	Middle management in business is generally ignored.
(1)	Υ.	Business and industry will not employ the physically handicapped or those with a history of mental illness.
(2)	Z.	Personnel engaged in caring for the aged lack training or are in need of retraining.
	II. Co	mmunity Development
(8)	A.	Duplication of government and government services including schools.
(1)	В.	Annexation too difficult to accomplish.
(2)	C.	Small communities lack zoning regulations.
(4)	D.	Zoning regulations frequently unrealistic and do not anticipate expansion of city.
(1)	E.	Inadequate garbage disposal and sanitation program.
(2)	F.	City Charters and City Ordinances outdated and conflicting.
(1)	G.	Proper charts of city pipes, etc., not maintained.
(1)	Н.	Rising crime rate.
(1)	I.	Government purchasing of land reduces community income.
(2)	J.	In urban areas, the inner city is dying.
(1)	K.	Good people will not enter government.
	$\mathbf{I}_{^{1}\bullet}$	Communities need home rule.
(1)	M.	Rapid growth puts strain on community services.
(3)	N.	Transportation system into and through most communities is antiquated.
(8)	0.	Most communities lack comprehensive planning.
(1)	P.	Existing cor waity plans are not followed.



identified	Problem	i -
(4)	Q.	Industrial development is unplanned. What kind of industry and where.
(4)	R.	Leadership and citizens lack understanding of the broad concept of the community.
(1)	S.	Beautification programs are not properly planned, nor are they carried out.
(8)	T.	Communities lack leadership. Out-migration depletes supply.
(1)	U.	Public does not understand or use services of area planning and development commissions.
(5)	٧.	The approach to the unemployment and other community problems is not coordinated.
(4)	W.	Public apathy to community problems.
(1)	X.	Housing projects replace ugliness with ugliness
(1)	Υ.	Poverty groups do not appreciate the role which they can play in community development.
(1)	Z.	Leadership in slum areas are not interested in self-help.
(4)	AA.	Poor development of recreational facilities.
(1)		No planned and concentrated effort is being made to attract tourists.
(1)		Construction of new highways create need for new community arrangements.
(2)	DD.	Young talent leaves community because they are unable to find employment and opportunity for advancement.
(3)	EE.	Out-migration of skilled labor leaves the small community with high ratio of unskilled labor.
(1)		Modern technology in industry demands more sophisticated skills.
(8)	GG.	Current educational programs do not meet the manpower demands of industry and business.



Number of Conferences in which problem was identified	Problem
(1)	HH. Many citizens are unemployable and under- employed.
(4)	II. Motivation of unemployed to seek training and jobs is lacking.
(4)	JJ. Job training programs exclude the drop-out.
(1)	KK. Curriculum of the public school creates the "push-out."
(1)	LL. Forced racial integration of schools is causing problems.
(1)	MM. Communities are unable to retain teachers.
(1)	NN. Adult education programs for negroes inadequate
(1)	00. Pre-school programs for poverty groups frequently not available or are not utilized.
(2)	PP. Graduate training programs not available.
(2)	QQ. Inadequate overall educational planning.
(1)	RR. Library resources are not used in community planning.
	III. Civic Understanding
(1)	A. People no longer place high value on the free enterprise system.
(2)	B. Public apathy toward government.
	IV. Self-Realization
(1)	A. Decline of moral and ethical values.
(1)	B. Importance of cultural events not understood nor appreciated.
	V. Human Relations
(3)	A. Lack of mutual understanding among groups.
(3)	B. Government agencies do not develop and maintain good human relations with the public.



Number of Conferences in which problem was		
identified	Problem	•
(2)	C.	Inadequate communication between formal and informal groups.
(1)	D.	There is a need to bring slum groups together with similar groups from Watts, Harlem, etc., to see how their problems are being solved.
(1)	E.	Communications media frequently not helpful.
	VI. Fa	mily Life
(3)	A.	Lack of understanding and motivation for family planning in poverty groups.
(2)	B.	Home environment in poverty homes is bad. Children are unable to see beyond their own background.
(2)	C.	Poverty fa 'lies do not understand and appreciate the principles of child development.
(1)	D.	Effective programs in parent and family education not available.
(2)	E.	Illegitima .y.
(1)	F.	Children do not learn the value of work.
(1)	G.	Poverty groups do not know how to manage their money.
	VII. H	[ealth `
(3)	Α.	Inadequate sanitation services and practices.
(2)	₿.	Environmental health.
(2)		a. Water and air polution.
(1)		b. Handling of waste.
(1)	C.	Soaring VD rate.
(1)	D .	i .lly disturbed children not properly cared
(2)	E .	Communities are unable to get sufficient medical service, doctors, and nurses.



Number of Conferences in which problem was identified

Problem

(1)

F. Many cannot afford medical treatment even though they do not qualify for welfare programs.



LIST OF THOSE WHO ATTENDED COUNCIL OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS AND STATE-WIDE CONFERENCE, June 5-6, 1967 UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GEORGIA

Mr. Louis C. Alderman, President, Middle Georgia College

Dr. Donald D. Anderson, Associate Dean, Armstrong State College

Mr. Douglas R. Barnes, Academic Dean, Andrew College

Mr. Roy J. Boston, State Department of Public Health

Mrs. Christina M. Bowman, Southeast Water Laboratory

Mr. Nolen E. Bradley, Director, Title I, University of Tennessee

Mr. Linz C. Brown, Assistant Dean, Georgia Southwestern College

Dr. J. Fred Burgess, Director, Community Service Programs, Columbus College

Mr. John H. Carmichael, Director of Continuing Education, Brunswick Junior College

Dr. John Q. Caruthers, Office of Development, Spelman College

Mrs. Horace Clark, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs

Mr. Clifford M. Clarke, Executive Director, Associated Industries of Georgia

Dr. Morris Collins, Jr., Director, Institute of Government, University of Georgia

Dr. T. M. Cordell, Dean and Coordinator of Continuing Education, Abraham Baldwin College

Mr. Robert Crain, Reporter, The Atlanta Journal

Mr. Robert E. Croom, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Court

Mr. J. Kenneth Davidson, Armstrong State College

Mr. Curtis H. Driskell, Atlanta Chamber of Commerce

Dr. Irby D. Engram, Academic Dean, South Georgia College

Dr. Thomas W. Gandy, Vice President, Berry College

Mr. Hugh W. Gaston, Commission Chairman, State Commission on Aging

Mr. William Elmer George, Executive Director, Georgia Municipal Association

Mr. Thomas F. Gibson, Director, Health, Education & Training, Georgia Dept. of Health

Mr. Ross W. Hammond, Industrial Development Division, Georgia Institute of Technology Mr. Rutherford C. Harris, President, Student Government, University of Georgia

Mr. Rutherford C. Harris, President, Student Government, University of Georgia Mr. Walter W. Harrison, Director of Continuing Education, Valdosta State College

Mr. Robert S. Herndon, Associate Director, Continuing Education, Georgia Institute of Technology

Mr. Frank A. Hood, Community Development Department, Georgia Power Company

Dr. Prince A. Jackson, Savannah State College

Dr. Ben F. Johnson, Dean, School of Law. Emory University

Mr. Collus O. Johnson, Director of Adult Education, West Georgia College

Dr. William E. Johnson, Chairman, Division of Sciences & Mathematics, Albany State College

Mr. William L. Kinney, Assistant to Commissioner of Aging

Dr. J. J. Lancaster, Agricultural Extension Service, University of Georgia

Mr. John R. Lipscomb, Administrator, Berry College

Mr. Roger R. MacEldon, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity

Dr. Henry T. Malone, College Administrator, Governor, Georgia District of Kiwanis

Dr. Edmund C. Martin, Executive Director, Georgia Education Improvement Council

Mr. Paul Martin, Assistant Director, State Agency for Title I, University of Tennessee Dr. Ernest E. Melvin, Associate Director, Institute of Community and Area Development, University of Georgia

Mr. James C. Meredith, Georgia Water Quality Control Board

Mr. Robert W. Oertel, Soil Conservation Service

Mr. Cecil W. Page, Counselor, Young Harris College

Mr. Emory C. Parish, Executive Assistant Director, Highway Engineer, Georgia Highway Department



Mr. Leonard A. Robinson, Director, School of General Studies, Georgia State College

Mr. Lester T. Simpson, Director, Distributive Education, Abraham Baldwin College

Dr. H. Titus Singletary, Associate State Superintendent of Schools

Mr. Frank E. Stancil, State Department of Agriculture

Mrs. Hugh Stanley, League of Women Voters

Mr. Donald L. Southerland, Accountant, University of Georgia

Mr. Vernon R. Stuebing, Deputy Director, Georgia Planning Bureau

Mr. Joe Tanner, Community and Area Development Division, Georgia Electric Membership Corporation

Mr. Joseph A. Thornton, State Coordinator, Georgia Office of Economic Opportunity

Mr. Jerry W. Tyler, Director of Admissions, Norman College

Mr. S. L. VanLandingham, Farmers Home Administrator

Mr. H. Oliver Welch, State Planning Officer

Mrs. LeRoy A. Woodward, President, Georgia Congress of Parents & Teachers

Mr. R. L. Yobs, Industrial Development, Georgia Institute of Technology

Also present were: Mr. C. B. Lord, Coordinator, Georgia State Agency, Title I Mr. T. W. Mahler, Associate Director, Instructional Services Mr. James E. Watson, Community Development, University of Georgia



SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED IN EIGHT REGIONAL CONFERENCES

This is a summary of problems facing communities in Georgia which were suggested by 317 representative community leaders participating in 8 regional conferences held throughout the state during the last 3 months. The conferences were held in accordance with the State Plan for implementing Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 entitled Community Service and Continuing Education Programs. The purpose of the regional conferences was to obtain representative, "grass roots" judgments as to the community problems toward the solution of which the participating universities and colleges might design and offer educational programs for adult citizens of the state.

The Georgia State Plan provides further for a state-wide meeting of representative state leaders to review the problems suggested in the regional meetings, to make judgments as to their priorities and to assess their relative feasibility from the standpoint of whether or not educational programs can make significant contributions to their solutions. Representative state leadership thereby gives further guidance to the development of the state program which will be proposed using Fiscal 1968 supporting funds.



INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING PROBLEMS

In the <u>blank space</u> at the left of the designated problem areas, please indicate your estimate of the priority you would give it in developing relevant instructional programs. Use the following code:

- 1 First priority for immediate and continuing efforts If possible, about 25% to 60% of funds and effort should be devoted to this problem area.
- 2 High priority If possible, from 20% to 40% of funds should be devoted to this problem area.
- 3 Average priority If possible, about 10% to 20% of funds should be devoted to this problem area.
- 4 Low priority No more than from 1% to 10% of funds should be devoted to this problem area.
- 5 No priority.

In the <u>parentheses</u> at the left of each item, please indicate your estimate of the degree to which each designated need or problem is suitable and feasible for colleges and universities to develop educational programs relevant to its solution. Please take into account whether or not some other agency or level of education is more appropriate. Rate feasibility of items according to the following code:

- (A) Highly feasible and suitable
- (B) Feasible and suitable
- (C) Not feasible or suitable



OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE

Priority

1.5 * Local Government Officials

A great deal of concern was expressed concerning the problems growing out of the need of local government officials and employees, both elective and appointive, to develop a better understanding of their duties and responsibilities and to achieve higher levels of competence.

Among the problems mentioned which illustrate the need for training of local government officials were a lack of understanding of responsibilities, too low a level of skills needed, a lack of knowledge of recent legislation and court rulings at both the state and federal levels affecting their operations, a lack of skill in communications, poor human relationships, a lack of understanding of community problems caused by urbanization and technology, and a lack of knowledge of sources and means for financing local government services. Among personnel specifically mentioned as needing educational programs are the following:

Feasibility Rating		1
()	A.	Fiscal officers
()	В.	Tax administrators
()	C.	Law enforcement personnel
()	D.	Sanitation personnel
()	E.	Clerical personnel
()	\mathbf{F}_{ullet}	Mayors
()	G.	City and county managers
()	Н.	Councilmen
()	I.	Commissioners
()	J.	Department heads
()	K.	Lay board members

^{*} This figure is an average of the priority ratings with one representing the highest priority and five representing no priority.



Priority

3.5 Educational Personnel

Developing the occupational competence of educational personnel was also mentioned frequently. Among the problems pointed out was the absolute lack of training or inadequate training of sub-professional personnel, the lack of ability of teachers and specialized professional school people to work with poverty groups, people with handicaps, functional illiterates, and the general inadequate number of effective adult educators. More specifically, emphasis was placed on the training of:

Feasi Ratin	bility g		
()	L.	Counselors who work with poverty groups
()	M.	Bus drivers
()	N.	Teacher aides
()	0.	Educational planning and development personnel
()	P.	Substitute teachers
()	Q.	Adult educators
()	R.	Teachers of the physically and mentally handicapped
()	s.	Teachers in the vocational and technical fields

3.6 Others

Other fields suggested in which programs should be developed for the improvement of competency include:

Feasibility Rating		
()	T.	Business leaders
()	U.	Middle management in business
()	V.	Personnel engaged in caring for the aged
()	W.	Personnel working with the menially ill



	Additions		
()	x.	
()	Y.	
()	z.	

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The greatest number of expressions of concern dealt with the broad problem area of community development. These can be classified generally under the headings of local government and planning. Problems of planning are dealt with under the sub-headings of comprehensive planning, industrial development, manpower development and education.

Local Government

Many problems were identified concerning inadequacies of local government (city, county, and combined) requiring fundamental action for effective community development. Prominent among these were:

Priority	Feasibility Rating		
2.8		A.	Local government structures and their legal foundations are too often outdated.
	()		(1) Irrational and non-functional allocations of government services and responsibilities between cities and counties lead in many instances to wasteful duplication of services and in others to failure by either city or county to provide needed services.
	()		(2) City charters and ordinances are too often outdated and conflicting.
	()		(3) Local ordinances are often adopted using unlawful procedures, which, if challenged, would void them.
	()		(4) Too many local government matters are decided by state legislation or by state departments. Local communities need an adequate home rule plan to deal with strictly local matters.



PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS FOR USE OF FISCAL 1968 FUNDS ASSUMING 75%-25% MATCHING

Since Georgia's share of the Congressional appropriation for Title I is not yet known, the proposed allocation for programs will be equal to the total Georgia share of the appropriation less the amount budgeted for administration. The proposed program budget reflects the percentage of the funds available for programs which will be allocated to the problem areas given priority in Fiscal Year 1968.

	Percent	of	Program	Funds
--	---------	----	---------	--------------

Prog	gram		Federal Funds	Matching Funds	<u>Total</u>
1.	Community Planni Development	ing and	40%	40%	40%
2.	Occupational Cor Government Perso		35%	35%	35%
3•	Human Relations	- Communicat	ions 25%	25%	25%
Admi	inistration	Total	100%	100%	100%
-	cating Expenses		\$ 2 , 575	\$ 858	\$ 3,433
Trav	<i>r</i> el		3,375	1,125	4,500
Capi	ital Outlay		450	150	600
Pers	sonal Services		18,600	6,200	24,800
		Total	\$2 <i>5</i> ,000	\$ 8,333	\$ 33,333



Priority	Feasibility Rating		
	()		(5) There are too many, too small local government units for economical and efficient provisions of many services. How can rational consolidation and coordination of local government units be achieved?
3.7	()	В.	Effective zoning plans and regulations are too often either non-existent, inadequately enforced, or unrealistically designed.
3.1		С.	Needed government services are too often either non- existent, inadequate, or inefficient.
	()		(1) Transportation facilities, traffic arteries, and traffic control.
	()		(2) Garbage disposal, sewerage, and environmental sanitation in general.
	()		(3) Law enforcement and procedures for handling and treating the criminal offender are inadequate in the face of rising rates of crime, juvenile delinquency, and apparent growing disrespect for the law and law enforcement officials.
	()		(4) Inflexibility of organization for government services result in costly time loss in rapidly growing areas and wasteful continuation in areas of declining need; simultaneously there is a tendency toward irrelevance of services to needs in areas of rapid change.
	()		(5) Basic community engineering services are too often poorly designed and operated from the standpoints of efficiency, safety, and aesthetics.
	()		(6) Public utilities service, with especial attention to water supply, needs to be expanded and improved qualitatively.
2.9		D.	Public demand for quality and quantity of services in urban, suburban, and rural areas greatly exceed local public financial resources to meet them.

ERIC Adultion Provided by FIET

Priority	Feas:	ibilit ng	y -		
	()		(1)	Local government tax sources and revenue raising measures are inadequate, inflexible, pre-empted by other levels of government, and subject to special interest and political manipulation.
	()		(2)	Increasing government purchase of land for roads and streets, public buildings, parks, and similar public uses reduces local government income from property taxes.
	()		(3)	The flood of desirable public programs at state and federal levels, requiring local financial participation to qualify, strait-jackets local ability to support strictly local services or else forces local communities to forego the benefits of state and federal programs - a dilemma requiring compromises too often impossible to achieve on a rational basis.
Planning					
A g	great d	le al of	attent identif	ion w ied i	as given to the role of planning in community ncluded:
1.8			Α.	comm	rehensive community planning is the key to effective unity development but it is often non-existent and e existing the plans are too often not followed.
	()		(1)	Leadership and general citizenship lack understanding of the broad concept of the community.
·	()		(2)	Many communities lack leadership with out-migration depleting the limited supply.
)		(3)	The public does not understand or use services of Area Planning and Development Commissions, state and federal agencies, business and industrial organizations, colleges and universities, libraries, volunteer organizations, and other basic resources for assistance in planning.
	()		(4)	There is too much public apathy about community problems.
	()		(5)	Poventy mound do not appropriate the series of

play in community development.



Priority	Feasi Ratin	bility g			
	()		(6)	Indigenous leadership in slum areas are not interested in self-help.
	(.)		(7)	Established leadership too often is complacent about community development problems.
2.9			В.		ning is inadequate or non-existent in specific s of community life.
	()		(1)	Industrial development
	()		(2)	Beautification
	()		(3)	Housing
	()		(4)	The decaying inner city
	()		(5)	The declining small towns and villages
	()		(6)	Recreational facilities and programs
	()		(7)	Tourist attractions, facilities, and service
	()		(8)	Public transportation
	()		(9)	Highways and streets
2.8			C.		ower Supply and Demand is a constantly variable lem requiring systematic and continuing planning.
	()		(1)	Communities are losing young, trained talent because of insufficient suitable employment with opportunities for advancement.
	()		(2)	Small communities tend to have an over-supply of unskilled labor due to the out-migration of skilled labor.
	()		(3)	Large cities are attracting unskilled and unemployable people seeking both job opportunities and the greater diversity of public supporting services available. This creates "pockets of poverty" and creeping slums.
	()		(4)	Too many citizens are either under-employed or unemployable.



Priority	Feasi Ratin	bility g			
	()		(5)	Modern technology demands more sophisticated skills with job opportunities for the unskilled rapidly vanishing.
	()		(6)	The motivation to seek training and jobs is too often lacking on the part of the unemployed and the unskilled.
	()		(7)	The relationship of unemployment and poverty to other community problems is not properly understood and efforts to deal with them are therefore not properly coordinated.
	()		(8)	Job opportunities are not sufficiently available for the physically or mentally handicapped.
3.1			D.		eational planning is too often neither sufficiently prehensive nor coordinated.
	()		(1)	Narrow and restricted curricula create the "push out."
	()		(2)	Educational programs too often fail to meet the manpower demands of business and industry.
	()		(3)	Inadequate and insufficient educational and training programs are available for "drop-outs," jobs, adults, Negroes, poverty groups, the handicapped, functional illiterates, pre-schoolers, and at the graduate level.
	()		(4)	Too many communities are unable to secure and rotain an adequate supply of qualified teachers.
	()		(5)	The conditions surrounding forced integration of schools create new problems in the effort to solve others and therefore inhibits effective planning for integration.

Other problem areas identified, while not eliciting as many specific problems as those listed under Occupational Competence and Community Development, nevertheless were sources of serious concern.

Human Relations - Communications

Priority	Feasibility Rating		
		A.	Serious lack of mutual understanding and effective communications exist too often between the following groups -
	()		(1) Urban and rural
	()		(2) White and non-white
	()		(3) The affluent and the non-affluent
	()		(4) Youth and adults
	()		(5) Labor and management
	()		(6) Official, public agencies and volunteer organizations and agencies
<u> </u>	()	В.	Representatives of groups with common interests from different communities need to meet together more often to share their experiences in dealing with common problems.
<u> 3.1</u>		C.	Crucial community institutions need to re-examine their respective and joint roles in maintaining positive and effective communications between community groups and in fostering desirable human relationships. High among these are -
	()		(1) The mass media of communications
	()		(2) Educational institutions
	()		(3) Business and industry and their associations
	()		(4) Government officials and agencies at all levels
	()		(5) Labor unions



Priority	Feasil Ratin	bility g		
	()		(6) Racial and ethnic organizations
It foster misu				often such institutions impede communications and
Family Life	<u>.</u>			
3.1	()	Α.	The family unit is the focal point of problems and their solution in the War on Poverty-education and training, employment, family income, family planning, illegitimacy, money management, housekeeping, nutrition, health, housing, self-help, wholesome recreation, community participation, child rearing, and the like.
3.4	()	В.	Effective programs in parent and family life education are too often not available.
3.9	()	С.	Children and youth need responsible work experience that is educative much earlier in life.
3.3	()	D.	Problems of family financial management and consumer education are badly needed for families at all economic levels.
3.8	()	E.	More and a greater diversity of out-of-school youth programs and services are badly needed.
3.6	()	F.	More and a greater diversity of programs and services for the aging are badly needed.
3.8	()	G.	Family social services should be greatly extended and improved - including the provision of more foster homes and day-care centers.
3.7	()	Н.	There is need for a larger supply of adequately trained social workers to staff the services of public and private agencies - this includes the gamut of need for trained professionals, technicians, and aides.
Health				•
3.3	()	Α.	The diversity and magnitude of need for medical and health services create critical shortages of medical, paramedical, and public health personnel including doctors and dentists, nurses, technicians, and the like.



Priority	Feasibility Rating				
3.7	()	В.	Small communities find it difficult to attract and hold medical and health personnel while those practicing in large cities are inundated by demands for their services from mass populations.	
3.8	()	C. .	There are general shortages of medical treatment facilities and equipment as well as their rapid obsolescence, creating almost insurmountable financial barriers to adequate operation of hospitals, clinics, and the like.	
3.2.			D.	Greater emphasis is needed on preventative health and medical practices and on early treatment.	
	()		(1) Environmental health including water, air, and food polution control, the handling of sewage and other waste, etc.	
	()		(2) Nutrition and physical fitness programs	
	()		(3) Community mental health services	
	()		(4) Early and concentrated attacks on communicable diseases; for example, the resurgence of soaring venereal disease rates.	
Other					
<u> </u>	()	A.	Continuing strands throughout discussion of problems were efforts to verbalize underlying causes. Most of these comments dealt with attitudes, values, and ideals, using such expressions as "the decline of ethical and moral values"; "people don't care"; "individual initiative and free enterprise are no longer valued"; "the importance of cultural activities and events are not understood or appreciated"; "the public is apathetic toward government"; "all people want is to have a good time."	
	()	В.	If your experience and observations indicate other important community problems or areas not dealt with here, please add them below:	
				(1)	
				(2)	

Use reverse side for additional space.

RANK ORDER ASSIGNED TO BROAD PROBLEM AREAS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Problem Areas	Points Assigned
Community Development and Planning	69
Occupational Competence	60
Human Relations - Communications	60
Self Realization	35
Family Life	32

Participating institutions were asked to rank order the broad problem areas assigning priorities of one through six. Points were computed by assigning a value of six to the first priority and a value of one to the sixth priority.

THE LIBRARY OF
OCT 18 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION

